

**REMARKS**

Reexamination and reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested.

The claims have been amended to address the 35 USC §112, second paragraph rejections.

With respect to the obviousness rejections and the double patenting rejections, the undersigned is confused in that the Examiner has now rejected the method claims previously indicated as allowable without any comment as to how the references teach or suggest these method claims. Clarification is requested as the art rejection is solely discussed relative to the product claims and the method claims are not discussed in the Office Action.

With respect to the product claims, there are three critical aspects of the coating provided in the present invention which are not taught or suggested in the art.

First, the claims require film forming polymer forming the coating is on a given face of the porous substrate where the coating does not penetrate through the porous substrate to the opposite face of the porous sheet. This is extremely important in that the porous sheet must remain porous on the opposite face in order to adequately function as an oil absorbing material but also make sure that the coating is firmly anchored onto the porous material such that does not readily delaminate.

Second, the Examiner is stating that additives could comprise polyvinyl alcohol in polyethylene glycol, referring to the disclosure at pages 9-11 of Kondo. Looking at page 9 of Kondo, it states that “an oil cleaning sheet for make-up...in which at least one surface of said porous...film contains a hydrophilic liquid-absorbing substance which is at least partially distributed on the surface.”. The hydrophilic liquid absorbing substances are then listed at page 10, lines 16-30 which includes a wide variety of materials including polyvinyl alcohol and polyethylene glycol. On page 11, it goes on to say that these hydrophilic liquid absorbing substances are in a “coating solution” which is coated onto the oil cleaning sheet. Note, page 11, lines 29 on. Polyvinyl alcohol and polyethylene glycol are not additives but are the coated liquid-absorbing substances themselves. They are film forming polymers not additives to a film forming polymer.

Finally, the additive to the film forming polymer of the claimed invention is an additive delivers a benefit to the skin or hair upon wiping. This has been added to the claims. The specific additives taught in Kondo relative to additive for inclusion within the porous film per se, not to the coating and are taught not at pages 14-15 but rather pages 6-7. These are additives that are used to modify the characteristics of the porous film which is a polymeric material and would provide no benefit to the skin or hair. These additives are intended to be locked with in the polymeric structure of the thermoplastic extruded porous film. None of these additives are additives which are even capable of providing benefit to skin or hair. They are things like pigments to change the color of the thermoplastic film or surface modifying agents which would affect the hydrophobicity or hydrophilicity of the film. There would be no reason to place any of these additives into the film forming polymers taught at pages 10 of Kondo and even if one were to do so, one still would not be providing an additive suitable for delivering a benefit to skin or hair.

Applicants request a telephone interview with the Examiner and the Examiner's supervisor to determine what is necessary to further this case towards allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

February 2, 2004  
Date

By: 

William J. Bond, Reg. No.: 32,400  
Telephone No.: (651) 736-4790

Office of Intellectual Property Counsel  
3M Innovative Properties Company  
Facsimile No.: 651-736-3833